

### REMARKS/AMENDMENTS

This paper addresses the issues raised in the Office Action made Final mailed December 21, 2005. This amendment is submitted in compliance with the guidelines of the revised amendment practice. See 1267 Off. Gazette 106.

Claims 1-6, 8 and 12 are currently pending. In the Office Action of December 21, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2 and 6 and objected to Claims 8 and 12. Claims 3-5 were withdrawn from consideration. Specifically, Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Yamaguchi. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Yamaguchi in view of either Wilson or Fowler. The Examiner, however, indicated that Claims 8 and 12 contained allowable subject matter, but were objected to due to being dependant upon rejected parent claims.


Claim 1 has been amended to incorporated the limitations of Claim 12 and Claim 8 has been amended to depend on Claim 1. Claim 12 has been canceled.

In light of the amendment to Claim 1, the rejection thereto is rendered moot. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the Claims, as amended, remaining in this application are in a condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

It is believed that no additional fees are required with the filing of this paper. In the event, however, fees are due with this paper, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Brent A. Capenart  
Reg. No. 39,620

Dated January 26, 2006  
LARIVIERE, GRUBMAN & PAYNE, LLP  
Post Office Box 3140  
Monterey, CA 93942  
(831) 649-8800